



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/775,228	02/11/2004	Steven Kunreuther	K&B-24	9902	
7590 02/16/2006			EXAM	EXAMINER	
EPSTEIN DRANGEL BAZERMAN & JAMES LLP Suite 820 60 East 42nd Street			SILBERMAN	SILBERMANN, JOANNE	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
New York, NY 10165			3611		
			DATE MAILED: 02/16/200	6	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/775,228	KUNREUTHER, STEVEN			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Joanne Silbermann	3611			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILI - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communica - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, be Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ING DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a re tition. y period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONT by statute, cause the application to become ABA	ATION. ply be timely filed THS from the mailing date of this communication. ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed or 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) Since this application is in condition for a closed in accordance with the practice upon the condition of the closed in accordance with the practice upon the closed in accordance.	☐ This action is non-final. allowance except for formal matte	• •			
Disposition of Claims					
4) Claim(s) 1-4,15-19 and 28-37 is/are pen 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are w 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-4,15-19,28-37 is/are rejected 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction Application Papers	ithdrawn from consideration.				
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) Applicant may not request that any objection Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by	to the drawing(s) be held in abeyand correction is required if the drawing(s	ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority doct 2. Certified copies of the priority doct 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International II * See the attached detailed Office action for	uments have been received. uments have been received in Ap ne priority documents have been noted. Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	oplication No received in this National Stage			
Attachment(s)					
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-93) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO-Paper No(s)/Mail Date 	Paper No(s)	ummary (PTO-413) //Mail Date formal Patent Application (PTO-152) 			

Application/Control Number: 10/775,228 Page 2

Art Unit: 3611

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-4, 15-19 and 28-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rethmeier, US #3,546,798 in view of Portmore, US #1,089,154.
- 3. Rethmeier teaches hangtags comprising connecting elements 32 extending between ends of adjacent hangtags (Figure 2) and spaced apart by openings 21. The connecting elements are severable by a pull force. Opening 36 in the hangtags body anchors fastener 37. The hangtags are connected by at least two or three connecting elements. Each tag includes an end having a substantially straight edge extending between corners on opposite sides (Figure 2). The connecting elements extend substantially the entire length of the tag.
- 4. Rethmeier does not teach the connected portion as being less than the open portion. Portmore teaches a separable tag including several separable portions. These portions are connected by a "plurality of widely separated connecting portions (page 1 lines 45-46). The separation area shows connecting portions c and (non-circular) openings c' along the entire edge of the tag. The openings are at least three times as long as the connecting portions (page 1 lines 76-78) and occupy a relatively small part

of the total edge (page 1 lines 98-100). The connecting portions resist accidental stress, but allow a portion to be torn off when desired (page 2 lines 26-33).

Page 3

- 5. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to utilize the particular spacing and sizing of the connecting elements as shown in Portmore on the tag of Rethmeier to provide a tag having a portion that may be removed when necessary but will not become inadvertently separated.
- 6. Rethmeier does not specifically teach a roll of tags, however this is well known in the art. Many tags, labels, etc. are produced in rolls. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to form a roll of such labels so as to provide a large number of labels in a convenient, easy to use form. It also would have been obvious so as to provide the labels in a form in which they will not become inadvertently separated.
- 7. Rethmeier and Portmore do not specifically teach the body as having rounded corners. Matters relating to ornamentation only, and having no mechanical function, cannot be relied on where claims are not directed to design but are structural claims. Also, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to utilize whatever shape opening is necessary in the body to best accommodate the fastener. It also would have been obvious to utilize rounded corners so that the edge would not be sharp or become torn.
- 8. Rethmeier and Portmore do not specifically describe the connecting portion as being a certain percentage of the spaced portion. Portmore states that the spaced portion is "more than three times as long" as the connecting portion, that the connecting portion occupies "a relatively small part" of the edge, and that the spaced portion is

"much longer than" the connecting portion. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to make the connecting portion less than 5, 10, or 25% of the spaced portion since it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Boesch*, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980).

9. Also, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to pick such a value since such a modification would have involved a mere change in size of a component. A change in size is generally regarded as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art. *In re Rose*, 105 USPQ 237 (CCPA 1955).

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments filed December 9, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In response to the amendments to the claims, a new reference has been applied.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joanne Silbermann whose telephone number is 571-272-6653. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 5:30 - 2:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lesley Morris can be reached on 571-272-6651. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/775,228 Page 5

Art Unit: 3611

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Alluni Silbermann Primary Examiner Art Unit 3611

js 09 February 2006